UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/975,264	10/12/2001	Tsukasa Saito	500.40756x00	8841

20457	7590	01/03/2005

ANTONELLI, TERRY, STOUT & KRAUS, LLP
1300 NORTH SEVENTEENTH STREET
SUITE 1800
ARLINGTON, VA 22209-9889

EXAMINER
GYORFI, THOMAS A

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2135	

DATE MAILED: 01/03/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PTO-90C (Rev. 10/03)

<table>
<tr><td rowspan="2">Office Action Summary</td><td>Application No.
09/975,264</td><td>Applicant(s)
SAITO ET AL.</td></tr>
<tr><td>Examiner
Tom Gyorfi</td><td>Art Unit
2135</td></tr>
</table>

-- *The MAILING DATE f this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --*

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) FROM
THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed
  after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any
  earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>23 July 2004</u>.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL.**   2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is
   closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) <u>1-2, 5-6</u> is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) <u>3,4 and 7-13</u> is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) <u>1-2 and 5-6</u> is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage
      application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3)☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.

5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6)☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1.   The correspondence filed 7/23/04

canceled claims 3, 4, and 7-13; and amended claims 1, 5, and 6. Claims 1, 2, 5, and 6

remain for examination.

Response to Arguments

2.   Applicant's arguments, see Paper No. 8, filed 7/23/04, with respect to the

rejection(s) of claim(s) 1, 2, 5, and 6 under Sloo in view of Rosen have been fully

considered and are persuasive. Therefore, the rejection has been withdrawn.

However, upon further consideration, a new ground(s) of rejection is made in view of

Sloo in view of Kanter et al.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3.   The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can

be found in a prior Office action.

4.   Claims 1, 2, 5, and 6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable

over Sloo (U.S. Patent 5,895,450) and further in view of Kanter et al. ("'No Problem'

Problem Tracking" © 1993 ACM).

Referring to Claim 1:

Sloo discloses a personal information managing method in a case of resolving a

dispute occurred by information sent out from an information processing apparatus,

comprising the steps of: accepting an input for designating sent-out contents capable of

being browsed on a provider-side processing apparatus connected via a network (col 3,

lines 5-20); receiving [ticket] information for identifying a sending-party sending out said

designated sent-out contents, from said provider-side processing apparatus (col 5, lines

10-20); transmitting said sent-out contents and said [ticket] information from a

deliberation-requesting-party-side processing apparatus to a deliberation support

processing apparatus to request a deliberation about said sent-out contents (col 7, lines

25-40; col 8, lines 15-60); receiving said sent-out contents and said [ticket] information

from said deliberation-requesting-party-side processing apparatus to store said sent-out

contents and said [ticket] information into a deliberation managing database in said

deliberation support processing apparatus (col 8, lines 30-60), said sent-out contents

becoming a target of said deliberation (col 8, lines 35-55); accepting an input of a

deliberation result of said requested deliberation to store said deliberation result into

said deliberation managing database (col 8, lines 50-60); transmitting said [ticket]

information stored in said deliberation managing database, from said deliberation

support processing apparatus to a ticket management processing apparatus (col 9,

lines 5-20); requesting presentation of personal information on said sending-party (col 5,

lines 10-45); receiving said [ticket] information from said deliberation support processing

apparatus (col 5, lines 10-20); transmitting said personal information on said

sending-party identified by said [ticket] information, from said [ticket] management

processing apparatus to said deliberation support processing apparatus when said

deliberation result indicates that said sent-out contents include an illegality (col. 16, lines

30-60); transmitting said deliberation result stored in said deliberation managing

database and said personal information on said sending-party received from said ticket

management processing apparatus, from said deliberation support processing

apparatus to said deliberation-requesting-party-side processing apparatus (col 9, lines

5-15); and receiving said deliberation result and said [ticket] information stored in said

deliberation managing database, from said deliberation support processing apparatus

(col. 8, lines 50-60).

Sloo does not explicitly disclose the use of "a ticket management apparatus".

However, Kanter discloses the claimed ticket management apparatus (Abstract, 2nd

paragraph). At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a

person of ordinary skill in the art to modify the teachings of Sloo such that the unique

email is replaced with a ticket. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been

motivated to do this because it would better enable users to analyze the complaints

being recorded (Abstract, 4th paragraph).

Referring to Claim 2:

Sloo in view of Rosen discloses the limitation of Claim 1 above. Sloo further

discloses accepting an input of inquiry contents toward said sending-party to store said

inquiry contents into said deliberation managing database (col 5, lines 55-65);

transmitting said inquiry contents and said ticket information stored in said deliberation

managing database, from said deliberation support processing apparatus to said ticket

management processing apparatus (col 4, lines 5-60); receiving said inquiry contents

and said ticket information from said deliberation support processing apparatus (col 4,

lines 15-35); making reference to a mail address indicated by a contact address

included in said personal information identified by said ticket information; and

transmitting said inquiry contents from said ticket management processing apparatus to

said mail address (col 9, lines 5-15).

Referring to Claims 5 and 6:

A personal information managing system in a case of resolving a dispute

occurred by information sent out from an information processing apparatus, comprising:

a deliberation requesting process unit for accepting an input for designating

sent-out contents capable of being browsed on a provider-side processing apparatus

connected via a network, for receiving [ticket] information for identifying a sending-party

sending out said designated sent-out contents, from said provider side processing

apparatus, and for transmitting said sent-out contents and said [ticket] information from

a deliberation-requesting-party-side processing apparatus to a deliberation support

processing apparatus to request a deliberation about said sent-out contents (col 8, lines

15-60; col 10, line 45-col 11, line 20; col 16, lines 30-65);

a deliberation accepting process unit for receiving said sent-out contents and

said [ticket] information from said deliberation-requesting-party-side processing

apparatus to store said sent-out contents and said ticket information into a deliberation

managing database in said deliberation support processing apparatus, said sent-out

contents becoming a target of said deliberation (col 4, lines 1-60; col 5, lines 3-50);

a personal information presentation requesting process unit for accepting an input of a deliberation result of said requested deliberation to store said deliberation result into said deliberation managing database, for transmitting said [ticket] information stored in said deliberation managing database, from said deliberation support processing apparatus to a [ticket] management processing apparatus, and for requesting presentation of personal information on said sending-party (col 4, lines 10-35; col 5, lines 35-65);

a personal information presenting process unit for receiving said [ticket] information from said deliberation support processing apparatus, and for transmitting said personal information on said sending party identified by said [ticket] information, from said [ticket] management processing apparatus to said deliberation support processing apparatus; and a deliberation result informing process unit for transmitting said deliberation result stored in said deliberation managing database and said personal information on said sending-party received from said [ticket] management processing apparatus, from said deliberation support processing apparatus to said deliberation-requesting-party-side processing apparatus, and receiving said deliberation result and said ticket information stored in said deliberation managing database, from said deliberation support processing apparatus (col 8, line 50-col 9, line 15).

Sloo does not explicitly disclose the use of "a ticket management apparatus". However, Kanter discloses the claimed ticket management apparatus (Abstract, 2nd paragraph). At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify the teachings of Sloo such that the unique

email is replaced with a ticket. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been

motivated to do this because it would better enable users to analyze the complaints

being recorded (Abstract, 4th paragraph).

Prior Art

5.   The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to

applicant's disclosure.

U.S. Patent 4,464,543 issued to Kline et al., teaches a telecommunication

network has a plurality of tandem node switches interconnected by trunks. Each switch

generates message detail records (MDR) which are transmitted by data links to a

network control center. In response to complaints, an NCC operator can start a

mechanized search of MDR to retrace the path a call had earlier taken. The retraced

path may be graphically illustrated on a display network map. Data from each call trace

may be stored in a call trace log for subsequent retrieval. Of particular relevance is the

use of a ticket management apparatus (element 63 of Figure 9).

"Selection Criterion and Implementation of a Trouble Tracking System: What's in

a Paradigm?", by Dan Bloom, © 1994 ACM. This reference teaches a general purpose

trouble tracking system that includes the use of tickets (page 201, column 2, lines 32-

34), thus further establishing that the use of tickets (and an apparatus that processes

them) in a trouble/complaint management system was well known in the art at the time

the invention was made.

Conclusion

6.   Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Tom Gyorfi whose telephone number is (571) 272-3849. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00am - 4:30pm Monday - Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kim Vu can be reached on (571) 272-3859. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the

Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for

published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.

Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should

you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic

Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

TAG
12/21/04

KIM VU
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100